

# THE AMERICAN.

A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER.

"AMERICA FOR AMERICANS."—We hold that all men are Americans who swear allegiance to the United States without a mental reservation in favor of the Pope.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

VOLUME III.

OMAHA, NEBRASKA, FRIDAY, MARCH 31, 1893.

NUMBER 13

## FOR THE EDIFICATION

Of the Venerable Priest of St. Barnabas Episcopal Church.

Are These Few Historical Facts Laid Before the Reading Public at This Time and in This Way.

Rev. Williams' comments on our article of Feb. 24th, appear on the second page of this issue. It is simply a deluge of words. It contains not a scintilla of evidence, not a verified fact in opposition to what we advocate. It is filled with assertions, denials and charges, such as any school boy could jumble together, incapable of proof, notoriously untrue, and absolutely misleading. Denuded of all its sophistry Rev. Williams' article stands forth as the most amusing screed which ever emanated in a so-called Protestant brain. It certainly was not written in what we term calm and sober moments—but when his Catholic blood was at fever heat.

But, before we go into a discussion of Rev. Williams' article we desire to call the readers' attention to one prominent thing in his little paper. In the first column, on the first page, in what printers term the staff, set in nonpareil type, it is solemnly affirmed that the "Messenger" is a parish paper with a Catholic purpose." We suggest that he change that line and make it read "The Messenger is a parish paper with a Roman Catholic purpose." After reading his article which appears on the second page all will agree that the suggestion is timely.

In the third paragraph of his effusion Rev. Williams says: "THE AMERICAN politely but firmly declares of us that we are 'a Jesuit in the garb of a Protestant minister.'" Rev. Williams was not mistaken when he penned those words—he simply, deliberately, stated an untruth. But that seems to be his strong point in writing. In a former issue of his paper he put words in our mouth that were never there, and shows the animus which prompted their use by saying in the last issue that it is "true THE AMERICAN tries to crawlfish." No man has yet seen an item in these columns that justifies Rev. Williams or any other man in the assertion that we "tried to crawlfish." We understand the English language and a man, "though a fool," can understand what we write. If we make a mistake we correct it, believing a man can afford to treat his opponents with courtesy and fairness. And that is what Rev. Williams will get when we deal with him whether he accords us the same treatment or not.

We do not object to Rev. Williams wearing any shoe that fits him, but he must not say, in the hope of creating sympathy for his cause, that we have said something which we have not. He must be honest.

In the fourth paragraph he says "For whatever sins may be laid at the door of the Jesuits, no one can justly charge them with moral cowardice, or with the infamy of warping upon women, as is the case with those 'American patriots' who are represented by such sheets as THE AMERICAN." What holy men they are—who rob a destitute widow of her last dollar through the plea that the soul of her dear departed is suffering the torments of the damned in purgatory! What honest men—who will forge correspondence between parent and child in order that the latter may be induced to sign away his inheritance for the benefit of the church! (Buffalo Cicero Narrative pages 39 to 46.) What truthful men—who will tell an untruth and confirm it with an oath! (Father Garnet connected with the Gunpowder Plot in England.) It is these beasts who believe "faith is not to be kept with heretics," except in cases of "ecclesiastical utility," who believe the Machiavellian policy "the end justifies the means," who believe the highest notch in christian perfection is attained when they become in the hands of their superior as the "clay in the hands of the potter, as a corpse, or as a rod in the hands of an enfeebled, old man," (page 3630 of the Encyclopedia Britannica, or when they subjugate independence and take pride in learning to OBEY. It is these creatures, these slimy, crawling, creeping things, who teach that you must do wrong if your superior declares it right, (page 3630 of Encyclopedia Britannica) for "ecclesiastical utility," whom Father Williams would choose for associates in preference to members of patriotic organizations. It is these men, whose chief justifies the commission of any or every crime for the furtherance of Jesuit schemes, whom Rev. Williams would choose for companions in preference to an A. P. A. And it is

of these men whom Rev. Edward Beecher, D.D. wrote on page 124 of his "Papal Conspiracy Exposed," wherein he states that "any Romanist, whether layman or ecclesiastic, can profess to be a Protestant and join any Protestant church, for the sake of acting more effectually to undermine Protestantism and to extend the power of the papacy. There is the best ground to believe that this has been done in the English Protestant church on a great scale." It is this class whom Father Williams would meet in common ground, to such we commend.

In the next paragraph he says "our position is simply that of christian manhood!" My God! Whither has christianity drifted? What plane has manhood reached? When a man who claims to be a Protestant Divine maligns, censures and condemns a vast army of christian men—ministers and laymen—in order to cool his indignant Roman Catholic blood? Surely these are those latter days when the man of sin stands revealed and the end of time has come.

He continues: "For every purpose of this debate we stand simply as a man and as a christian, utterly laying aside for the time every contention that may exist between Canterbury and Rome, just as we would lay aside every contention that might exist between Canterbury and Geneva, if it were the Presbyterian church that was attacked by such anti-christian defamation as that with which THE AMERICAN assails Roman Catholics week after week." Show your readers one case where we have defamed Roman Catholics and we will apologize to them.

You term this a debate, then cite your authorities, produce your defamations; let us not deal in assertions—but facts.

Nothing is to be gained by general denials, by indiscriminate charges or innuendoes.

This age is filled with reading, thinking, men and women, capable of judging between the merits and demerits of what we may write, and as they are our audience let us be candid: When and in what way have we defamed Roman Catholics?

But it is the next sentence where the Roman Catholic blood crops out in Rev. Williams' article. In it we find a positive renunciation of not only the claims of his own church but of every other Protestant church so far as it and they claim to be true churches of God. Hear him: "We are not in position to speak for the Roman Catholic church as an ecclesiastical organization whose dominating head sits enthroned at Rome, supreme by Divine right, over all christians and over all earthly powers."

The next paragraph contains nothing deserving of notice—being composed of thirteen lines of senseless drivel. But in the one that follows it he reiterates his groundless charge that THE AMERICAN wages an unmanly warfare on christian womanhood. State an instance. Give us the date, volume and number of the paper in which the warfare occurs. This assertion he follows with another equally as groundless and even more foolish. He says he stands "as a christian to denounce its infidel attack on principles that are common both to Catholic and Protestant christianity."

If Rev. Williams tells the truth—and we presume he does since he has only twice, in as many months, credited us with saying things we never uttered—one of the best little mothers who ever raised a boy and taught him to honor, love and revere God and His Word must have felt greatly mortified when she saw it in our paper. And yet, Father Williams must be in error. It has been less than two weeks since a leading infidel was in our office, complaining that there was too much God in it—that there was not a line in favor of Free Thinkers.

Father Williams says "if Roman Catholics are plotting, 10,000,000 of them to destroy the civil and religious liberty of the other 60,000,000 of us, that should be susceptible of proof." It is susceptible of proof. But what will Father Williams accept as proof? Will he accept the late display of armed Hibernians on our streets on St. Patrick's day? Will he accept the fact that 500 Hibernians have lately been admitted to the state militia of Illinois, after drilling illegally with arms for nearly seventeen years? Will he accept the declaration sent out from Rome less than two years ago with the consent of the prisoner of the vatican that the pope had set aside \$5,700,000 for exceptional purposes, such as war, which was published in the Omaha Daily Bee of Sunday, May 24, 1891.

If he will not accept that what will he accept?

Rev. Williams speaks of "landlord-cursed Ireland." We move to amend, by striking out "landlord-cursed" and inserting in lieu thereof "priest-ridden."

He also calls vehemently for the Orangemen to come out into the open day, and declares that if Lincoln and Garfield were assassinated by Roman Catholics the courts are open for the trial of such traitors. We were always under the impression that Mary Surratt, Spangler, Atzerodt, Herold and Payne were tried and condemned to death, while O'Laughlin was sentenced to imprisonment for life at hard labor by a lawfully constituted court martial. And this is susceptible of proof. We have somehow got it into our head that the same treatment was accorded to Guitau as to Surratt et al., but according to Rev. Williams, we must be hopelessly ignorant of American history. But, such is our worthy opponent's argument. So subtle, so convincing and at times so sarcastic.

"But Roman Catholics are aiming to bring America into spiritual subjugation to the bishop of Rome!" he continues. That does not concern the A. P. A. or the Orangemen. They care not how, when or where a man worships God. So far as they are concerned there will be no objection raised to spiritual Rome. There will be objections raised however to political Rome and that is what we are bound together to defeat. No man who believes the pope of Rome can absolve him from his oath of allegiance to this country should be invested with citizenship much less be qualified to hold office. Probably you will say that the church does not teach that pernicious doctrine, and if you do we can get the proofs to back up our charge that that is a tenet of the Roman Catholic church. (See page 352, vol. VII, *Romer's Federer*.)

After considerable gush about the Jesuits, and a few concealed flings at the Orangemen, he says if Bishop Scannell will permit, he will stand in the place (probably meaning his place) and answer THE AMERICAN'S questions. He takes up the first one, "does not the Roman Catholic church hold that all persons married outside the influence of said church—those married by ministers of other denominations and by civil officers—are not legally married?" He answers positively no, and follows it with a "but," etc., attempting to justify one wrong by another. We say that is a doctrine of the infallible church. It was declared by Pius VII. in 1808, (*Quarterly Register*, Vol. III., page 89, quoted by Rev. J. G. White on page 13 of his tract "Facts for the People") and reaffirmed by Pius IX. in 1855, *Vatican Documents* No. 51, in his allocution as to the government of Sardinia.

To the second question, "Does it not hold that the wives of all men so married are concubines and their children illegitimate?" he also says "no," and goes on with his attempt to justify one wrong by another. We answer, the Roman Catholic church does teach that very thing, and refer you to the above mentioned allocution of Pius IX.

He asks that the question "Do you not believe and teach that the pope has power to absolve from all sins, and from oaths of allegiance?" be divided, and makes answer as follows:

When penitence intervenes between the sinner and his sin the Roman church teaches that the pope can absolve from all sins. Otherwise God Himself cannot absolve from sin, for it would be contrary to His justice and nature to do it.

He follows this with a declaration as to what the "ministerial attache of THE AMERICAN would do in similar cases, about which he is about as competent a judge as he is a defender of the papacy.

To the second section of the sentence he says: "As to absolving subjects from their allegiance, the power to do that used to be asserted by the popes." We will call to mind in connection with this admission, without quoting his justification of one wrong by the citation of another, by saying that the Roman Catholic church is unchangeable; that "what the church has done, what she has expressly or tacitly approved in the past—that is exactly what she will do, expressly or tacitly approve in the future, if the same circumstances occur." (Orestes A. Brownson in his *Roman Catholic Quarterly Review*.) Brownson was the foremost Catholic writer in this country and his words should re-echo through the heart of every true patriot, and put to shame such Protestant defenders of the papacy as Rev. John Williams of St. Barnabas Episcopal church of this city.

And that expression by Brownson is not so old, but what Rev. John Williams could have read it the day it was issued had he been fortunate enough to have secured a copy of the *Review*. And, if we must admit it, we believe Brownson is a better authority on Roman dogma than Rev. John Williams can ever hope to be—as he had the endorsement of the American papal bishops in 1854, and published, according to his own words, only such articles as they approved.

Rev. Williams, after sating all around the circle says:

And as for Irish Roman Catholics, who are the special objects of THE AMERICAN'S hatred, we do not believe that all the ancient founders of the vatican could ever make them render straight allegiance to Queen Victoria.

What an admission to come from their own champion! The Irish disloyal to their own sovereign? Traitors to their queen? Robbers? Ye gods! What next may we expect? If it is humiliating to have an Orangeman question their loyalty, how crushing then the ignominy of such a characterization by a patron—a champion, if you please.

To the question, "Do you not believe and teach that all who die without embracing that religion are damned, and that they all go to hell?" he says "no" with another justification. We say "Yes" to that question, and you can find the evidence in "Familiar Explanations of Catholic Doctrine," a Roman Catholic work edited by Rev. M. Muller, printed by Benziger Bros. in 1888, bearing the imprimatur of Cardinal Gibbons and strongly endorsed by many Roman prelates. Your attention is also called to the following, taken from "Familiar Explanations of Christian Doctrine," Lesson xli:

Question.—Since the Roman Catholic church alone is the true church of Jesus can anyone who dies outside of the church be saved?

Answer.—He cannot.

Question.—What do the fathers of the church say about the salvation of those who die out of the Roman Catholic church?

Answer.—They all, without exception, pronounce them infallibly lost forever.

"Is it not a fact that your church is seeking to destroy the efficiency of the public schools?" is the next question which Father Williams answers in "his own way." Just what he intends to say is not quite clear. He may mean to convey the idea that they are not making such an attempt, or he may mean to admit that they are. True it is, he says, after getting his second wind, that Roman Catholics are asking for a division of the school fund. He also declares that they violate no law in making this request, and asks if it is wrong to levy a tax for the support of religion, why is it any less a wrong to levy a tax to support a system of education that is confessedly opposed to the interests of their religion? The premises from which Rev. Williams argues in this instance are manifestly absurd, and wholly wrong. He misunderstands why Rome opposes the public schools. It is not because the spiritual end of the corporation will suffer for whatever of good there is in it that cannot be hurt by the most impartial or indiscriminate study. The objection is made because political Rome will suffer. It is political Rome not religious Rome which seeks the destruction of the public school system. That this is so even Father Williams will not attempt to deny.

"Why, then, should it be a crime in Roman Catholics to claim the right to educate their own children in their own faith, and to be exempt from taxation for the support of Protestant children?" he continues. This question is not ambiguous, but it is calculated to place Romanism and Protestantism in a false light in their relations to each other, and we believe it is done intentionally. In the first place, no objection will be made to Roman Catholics educating their children in their own private schools as far as that education relates to faith, but the government has the right to say what amount of education shall be required of each of its citizens, and if the education acquired by attending those same private schools is below the standard set by the law-makers of this country, every citizen has a perfect right to object. They have a perfect right to demand a halt, and as the average intelligence in the Roman Catholic church in these United States is far below the minimum at the present time, it would not be putting it too strong to say, "educate your children or we will educate them for you." In the second place, even though they do pay taxes and refuse to send their children to the public schools, they are not contributing to the support of Protestant children, as the Roman Catholic church has billions of dollars worth of unimproved, untaxed property which should be upon the assessment rolls, the revenue from which would more than off-set what little papists contribute for the support of the public schools. This is susceptible of proof.

The next question, "when was the edict of Pius VII. rescinded, which branded the wives of all Protestants as concubines and their children as illegitimate," is answered in Father Williams' "own way," namely, a justification of one wrong by another. He says: "Popes rarely rescind their own, or

their predecessors' edicts, although they sometimes do, but they frequently permit them to fall into 'innocuous desuetude,' with the change of times and circumstances." "Innocuous desuetude" is not good. If he had said they frequently permit them to fall into desuetude his English would have been just as pure, if not quite as trim.

As we have before stated, the edict of Pius VII. was reaffirmed by Pius IX. in 1855 which shows the unchangeableness of the Roman corporation, and brings out in bold relief the words of Orestes A. Brownson which we have quoted above. Rev. Williams knows the boast of the Roman church—that she never changes—she is *semper eadem*.

This base, unchristian and unmanly characterization of the wives and children of ALL Protestants can be condoned and explained away by Roman sympathizers who are proud of the fact that they have Roman Catholic blood in their veins, but how heinous the crime if a Protestant asks "Do not priests ask of females in the confessional obscene and immoral questions?" If this is not Jesuitism what is it? If this is not attempting to tear down Protestantism and build popery on its ruins we cannot read or understand the English language. Out upon such Protestantism! It deserves more pity than contempt for its ignorance, so thinly veiled by pretensions to much learning.

To the next question Father Williams returns a square-toed answer. "Priests often have men and women confess to them that they have perpetrated serious crimes." He also admits that they allow such criminals to depart without offering to turn them over to a policeman. As with other wrongs committed by Rome he justifies their action by saying lawyers and doctors do exactly the same thing—that all are protected by law.

To the next question, "are not the Jesuits today exactly what they always have been—the worst enemies of the governments which harbor them?" he "presumes" they are today what they always have been, and, after throwing in one of his sarcastic(?) assertions parenthetically, declares that he "would give the palm, in that respect, to men who flaunt their orange banner in this free land." How he hates the orange! But it's that Roman Catholic blood—that national trait—which will not down. Why, Rev. Williams, is it worse to flaunt the orange in this free country than it is to flaunt the green? Is an Orangeman a greater bigot than a Hibernian? Is it more a crime for us to assail Romanism than for you to assail Orangeism or A. P. A.ism by innuendo?

By what process of reasoning do you arrive at the conclusion that a Roman Catholic who has committed the most atrocious crimes, and has been hanged, goes straight to the bosom of Christ, while Abraham Lincoln, who was murdered by a Roman Catholic, goes to hell, and suffers unspeakable agony while time endures?

Rev. Williams in answer to this question says it is authoritatively denied that Booth was a Roman Catholic. By whose authority? By that of the Roman Catholic church? Edwin A. Sherman, who took occasion to look this matter up, says Booth was a Romanist; so does Gen. T. M. Harris, one of the members of the court martial who tried Surratt, Payne, et al., as does Rev. Chas. Chiniquy, and as do men who live in Omaha today, who knew Booth, Surratt, Payne and Atzerodt. Will Rev. Williams give us just one authority in support of his many assertions? He says Booth's crime was committed by political feeling and not by religious conspiracy. And we desire again to inform Rev. Williams that that (the political end) is what we are opposed to in Romanism. We care not one iota how a man worships God. If he does not believe as we believe it will not effect our standing when we appear before that "last, supreme judge"—God—who will render to each man according to his works." Rev. Williams in the next paragraph says:

Bishop Scannell arrives at no such conclusion as that propounded by THE AMERICAN. He does not believe that a Roman Catholic convicted of, and hung for atrocious crimes goes straight to the bosom of Christ; neither does he teach that Abraham Lincoln went straight or at all to hell, or that he suffers, or will suffer unspeakable agonies while time endures. That is intended to be another clever question to fire the American heart, but it is born of utter ignorance of what the Roman church does teach, either as to bad Catholics or to good Protestants.

So you say. But we have long before this proved you as ignorant of Roman dogma as you are of the intents and purposes of the A. P. A. and the Orange associations, and shall now prove that you do not know what you are talking about when you make that assertion. The Roman Catholic church does not distinguish any difference between good and bad Protestants. There is but one class according to its dogma—the class that is born to be damned. Neither does it recognize

any material difference between those who die within the Roman church—they all eventually reach heaven, even if it is not until their relatives have spent their last dollar for masses. Rev. Williams has long posed before this community as a very learned man—whose opinion on questions under discussion was necessary for their final and satisfactory settlement—but if those former opinions have been as unreliable as those he has expressed in this article, this community has been sadly imposed upon. If Father Williams will refer to a standard Roman Catholic work referred to elsewhere in this article, namely, "Familiar Explanations of Catholic Doctrines," he will find, on page 120 this declaration:

"To be separated from the divine authority of the pope, is to be separated from God, and to have no place in the kingdom of Christ." If Rev. Williams does not have that little book in his library, he can find the same words quoted on page 84 of "Our Country," by Rev. Josiah Strong, D. D. In the same Catholic book, on page 164, he will find that it is held that "all those who wished to be saved, must die united to the Catholic church; for out of her there is no salvation." He will also find it is taught "that anyone separated from her (the church) however praiseworthy a life he may think he leads, by this crime alone, i.e., by his separation from the unity of Christ, he will be debarred from life eternal, and the wrath of God will remain upon him." (Appendix page 9.)

By a reference to the allocution of Pius IX., December 17, 1847, he will find this doctrine is sustained by the pope, for he says: "Quite recently—we shudder to say it—certain men have not hesitated to slander us by saying that we share in their folly, favor that most wicked system, and think so benevolently of every class of mankind as to suppose that not only the sons of the church, but that the rest also, however alienated from Catholic unity, are alike in the way of salvation, and may arrive at everlasting life. We are at a loss, from horror, to find words to express our detestation of this new and atrocious injustice that is done us." And so we might continue quoting page after page of Roman doctrine which does not sustain what Rev. Williams has said, but what would be the use?

Were we an older man than Rev. Williams, we should advise him to read, to study, and not write concerning something his words prove he knows nothing whatever about, or else that he wilfully misrepresents the case to his readers, but as we are not one-half as old as the priest of St. Barnabas we shall not design to advise our seniors.

Rev. Williams believes Peter Dens' theology is a standard work in the Roman church. Of it he says:

Answer. Peter Dens' moral theology is published in the Latin tongue. It is intended only for priests, and for the use of students in moral theology, in preparation for the priesthood. A book dealing with the sacred functions of life, or with the transgression of their rightful laws is to be considered obscene or otherwise according to the moral purpose of the writer, and the use to which the writer intends to have his book put.

He then takes up the "Kreutzer Sonata" which was excluded from the mails on account of its alleged obscenity, and says: "It was not an obscene book, for it came from the heart of its author with a high moral purpose. If it were written by Zola it would doubtless be obscene. The motive makes the difference." He then accuses Rev. J. G. White—by innuendo—with having translated Dens' work into two tongues in common use, and with having scattered it broadcast with malignant or mercenary motives. It must seem a little strange to some of our readers, that this same minister, Rev. Williams, can see the purity of purpose in Tolst's heart as he writes and publishes a book which the postal authorities say is obscene, and a moment later can look into Rev. J. G. White's heart and see the damnable guilt, the mercenary motive which prompted him to try and open the eyes of true and honest Roman Catholics to the danger in which they were placing their families through that damnable institution, the confessional! And now, to show you in a small way, what may be expected from the influence of that unholy institution, we quote from Rev. Edward Beecher's "Papal Conspiracy Exposed," page 178, as follows:

"It is because the confessional has become the soul trap of Satan and the well of all spiritual pollutions that the popular mind has revolted from the system throughout Germany, and will revolt from it, finally, everywhere."

On page 179 of the same work the author asks, "What, then, does Bishop Kenrick say as it regards the use of the confessional as a means of priestly seduction?" and answers it in the next sentence as follows: "He confesses in express terms, that it has been so

Continued on Fourth Page.